# Comparisons of ICG-fluorescence with conventional tracers in sentinel lymph node biopsy for patients with early-stage breast cancer: A meta-analysis

RUI YIN<sup>1</sup>, LU-YU DING<sup>2</sup>, QING-ZHONG WEI<sup>1</sup>, YA ZHOU<sup>3</sup>, GUANG-YUAN TANG<sup>3</sup> and XUN ZHU<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of General Surgery, Beijing Aerospace General Hospital, Beijing 100076;

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychiatry, The First Affiliated Hospital of China Medical University, Shenyang, Liaoning 110001; <sup>3</sup>Department of General Surgery, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Soochow University, Suzhou, Jiangsu 215004, P.R. China

Received November 18, 2019; Accepted August 24, 2020

DOI: 10.3892/ol.2020.12375

Abstract. Radioisotopes (RI) and blue dye (BD) are routinely used markers for staining during sentinel lymph node biopsy (SLNB) in breast cancer. Compared with traditional tracers, tracer performance of indocyanine green (ICG) has been controversial. A total of 21 studies were selected from the PubMed, EMBASE and Cochrane Library databases. Detection ability was judged based on four endpoints: i) The identification rate (IR) of the patients; ii) the IR of the sentinel lymph nodes (SLNs); iii) the IR of the positive SLNs; and iv) the false negative rate (FNR). Compared with BD, ICG was superior in terms of the IR of the patients [odds ratio (OR)=7.17; 95% CI, 3.98-12.94), the IR of the SLNs (OR=8.84; 95% CI, 6.71-11.66) and FNR (OR=0.20; 95% CI, 0.08-0.48) using a fixed-effects model. There was a significant difference in both the IR of the positive SLNs (OR=21.32; 95% CI, 2.84-160.14) and FNR (OR=0.46; 95% CI, 0.23-0.91) in the ICG vs. RI group. Furthermore, when using ICG at the recommended dose, a significant difference was found in the IR of the patients (OR=1.77; 95% CI, 1.09-2.85) and the IR of the SLNs (OR=21.62; 95% CI, 5.23-89.43) using a fixed-effects model. In the ICG vs. BD combined with RI group, there were no differences in either the IR of the patients (OR=5.10; 95% CI, 0.24-107.48) or the IR of SLNs (OR=5.10; 95% CI, 0.60-256.66). In conclusion, ICG was a better tracer

*Correspondence to:* Dr Xun Zhu, Department of General Surgery, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Soochow University, 1055 SanXiang Road, Suzhou, Jiangsu 215004, P.R. China E-mail: szdxfsdeyyzhuxun@163.com

*Abbreviations:* SLNB, sentinel lymph node biopsy; RI, radioisotopes; BD, blue dye; ICG, indocyanine green; IR, identification rate; SLN, sentinel lymph nodes; FNR, false negative rate

*Key words:* sentinel lymph node biopsy, indocyanine green, radioisotope, blue dye

compared with BD or RI alone and was not a worse tracer compared with BD combined with RI. The use of the recommended dose of ICG had an improved tracer effect. ICG is expected to be widely used in SLNB in view of its clinical advantages.

## Introduction

The sentinel lymph node biopsy (SLNB) method has been widely used to evaluate axillary lymphatic status. Compared with SLNB, the incidence and severity of postoperative complications, including lymphedema, swelling of the arm and sensory loss, caused by axillary lymph node dissection are higher (1). Since Krag et al (2) first reported the use of radioisotopes (RI) in 1993 and Giuliano et al (3) reported using blue dye (BD) in 1994, the combination of BD and RI has been used as a standard technique to increase the detection rate of sentinel lymph nodes (4). Certain clinical limitations of BD and RI, including allergies and radioactivity, have prompted the development of other tracer technologies (4). Indocyanine green (ICG)-guided SLNB has been employed for the staging of the axillary lymphatic status since 2005 (4) and numerous clinical trials and cohort studies have shown that ICG is a promising technology in patients with early stage breast cancer (4,5). Though the majority of these data supported the conclusion that using ICG was not worse in SLNB compared with other tracers, some studies reported that ICG is a less effective tracer. A systematic review performed in 2014 stated that ICG was significantly better than BD with regard to improving sentinel lymph node identification (5). However, a more recent systematic review reported that the ICG fluorescence method demonstrated improved axillary staging compared with the RI method (6). Therefore, it is difficult to draw a clear conclusion, because the results for comparing ICG with traditional tracers are usually contradictory. To the best of our knowledge, whether ICG can be applied clinically as a valid tracer and replace traditional standard techniques has not yet been established.

Considering the lack of conclusions regarding the clinical utility of ICG, the present study collected data from relevant

randomized controlled trials and cohort studies and compared the tracer ability of ICG with BD and RI, both individually and in combination. The aim of the present study was to confirm whether ICG can act as a better tracer agent compared with conventional techniques.

#### Materials and methods

Search strategy. The present study was performed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses statement (7). To assess the level of sensitivity, the main international electronic data sources, including PubMed (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov), EMBASE (http://www.embase.com) and the Cochrane Library (https://www.cochranelibrary.com), were searched simultaneously.

The terms 'breast cancer', 'sentinel lymph node biopsy', 'blue dye', 'indocyanine green', 'radioisotope' and similar terms were cross-searched using the following search algorithms: ((((breast cancer OR breast neoplasms OR breast carcinoma)) AND (SLNB OR sentinel lymph node biopsy)) AND (indocyanine green OR ICG OR radioisotope OR RI OR blue dye OR BD))). All relevant studies were published between May 2009 and March 2017.

Selection criteria. The current meta-analysis included all studies meeting the following criteria: i) Patients: Patients with clinical axillary lymph node-negative early breast cancer; ii) research methods: SLNB using ICG-guided near-infrared fluorescence imaging, using  $\geq$  two tracers and using the patient as the self control; iii) study type: Cohort study or randomized clinical trial; and iv) language: English.

The following exclusion criteria was used: i) Meeting abstracts and studies that did not contain comparisons of ICG with other tracers and articles with neoadjuvant therapy; ii) study sample sizes <10; iii) studies that performed axillary reverse mapping; and iv) studies that did not use the patients as their own controls.

All eligible studies were categorized into three groups: i) ICG vs. BD; ii) ICG vs. RI; and iii) ICG vs. BD and RI. The outcomes considered included studies that comprised the identification rate (IR) of the patients, the IR of the sentinel lymph nodes (SLNs) and the IR of the positive SLNs and false negative rate (FNR).

*Data extraction*. In the present study, RY and XZ assessed and screened the literature independently. Titles and abstracts were first inspected, then full texts of potentially relevant publications were obtained and screened. Any discrepancy was resolved by discussion between the reviewers. Disagreements were solved by full discussion until consensus was reached.

The characteristics of the cohort and randomized clinical studies, including first author, year of publication, number of cases and controls, device, dose of tracers and detection outcomes for each study are presented in Table I. Different equipment, including PhotoDynamic Eye (PDE), Mini-fluorescence-assisted resection and exploration (Mini-FLARE) and a charge-coupled camera (CCD) were used. *Quality assessment*. The quality and bias risk of the selected papers were critically appraised separately by RY and LD. A quality assessment was performed for each of the eligible studies using the validated Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (NOS) (8). This scale is composed of eight items that assess patient selection, study comparability and outcome with scores ranging 0-9. In the present meta-analysis, studies with a score of  $\geq 6$  were graded as high quality. The quality of the included studies assessed by NOS are presented in Table II. Disagreements were discussed until a consensus was reached.

Statistical analysis. Dichotomous results were summarized as pooled odds ratios (ORs) and 95% CIs around the point estimates. OR was abstracted or calculated to quantitatively evaluate the association between ICG and the other tracers. The overall pooled effect was assessed using the z-statistic with  $P \le 0.05$  indicating a statistically significantly difference. Heterogeneity between studies was assessed by the 'I2' value. When  $I^2 \ge 50\%$  or the P-value for the I<sup>2</sup> statistic was <0.05, which indicated significant heterogeneity across the studies, the pooled estimate was calculated using a random-effects model. If the data were contrary, a fixed-effect model was adopted. Statistical heterogeneity was explored using the  $\chi^2$  and Tau<sup>2</sup> statistical tests. Subgroup analysis was based on the ICG dose, and studies were divided into 'standard dose of reference', 'more than standard dose of reference' and 'less than standard dose of reference'. All statistical analyses were performed using RevMan software (version 5.3; The Nordic Cochrane Centre) and Stata software (version 15.1; StataCorp LLC). Forest plot and receiver operating characteristic plot were obtained to evaluate the sensitivity and specificity of subgroup. Funnel plots with Egger's test were used to identify publication bias. All analyses were based on previous published studies; therefore, no ethical approval or patient consent was required.

#### Results

Characteristics of eligible studies. A total of 262 articles were retrieved from PubMed, EMBASE and The Cochrane Library and, ultimately, 21 studies were selected with a total of 2,499 patients for detailed assessment (9-29). A flow diagram of the selection process is presented in Fig. 1. All the selected studies were scored  $\geq$ 6 according to NOS (Table II).

*Meta-analysis results*. Comparison of SLNB using BD, RI and ICG was performed in 21 studies and analyzed using four outcome variables. ICG was compared with BD alone, RI alone and RI with BD separately. The results of the meta-analysis are presented in Table III.

# ICG vs. RI

*IR of patients*. A total of 13 studies involving 1,731 patients reported the identification rate for patients using ICG and RI, which revealed no differences in the random-effects model (OR=1.63; 95% CI, 0.65-4.10; P=0.30; Fig. 2A). The heterogeneities of the detection rate of these patients were high ( $I^2$ =55%; P=0.02).

Taking the high heterogeneities into account, the concentration of ICG was variable and ranged from 0.1-10 mg/ml.

the current meta-analysis.
n
studies i
selected
De
f tl
Ö
group
each
Ξ.
details
al
technic
s and
. Characteristics
Б
Table

A, ICG vs. BD

			ţ	Concentration	Volume .	Doce		ц.	I	ositive	IR of pa	atients	IR of (	SLNs	IR posit SLA	of ive Ns	FNR	
Author, year	Type	trace	rs Device	mg/ml	ml ml	mg ,	Procedures	SLNs		patients	ICG	BD	ICG	BD	ICG	BD	ICG BD	(Refs.)
Hirano <i>et al</i> , 2012	Cohort	5	PDE	N/A	2.5	N/A	108	N/A	N/A	16	107/108	100/108	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1/16 5/16	(19)
Wishart et al, 2012	Cohort	3	PDE	0.39	2	0.78	104	201	25	18	104/104	101/104	201/201	191/201	25/25	25/25	0/18 0/18	(17)
van der Vorst, 2012	RCT	3	Mini- FLARE	0.39	1.6	0.62	12	19	N/A	N/A	12/12	12/12	19/19	16/19	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	(20)
Jung <i>et al</i> , 2014	RCT	3	ICG-F	0.6	1	9.0	43	N/A	N/A	6	43/43	39/43	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	(21)
Hojo et al, 2010	Cohort	3	PDE	N/A	2	N/A	113	N/A	N/A	31	113/113	105/113	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0/31 5/31	(22)
Sugie et al, 2013	Cohort	6	PDE	0.39	0.5 - 1.0	N/A	66	340	N/A	20	66/86	66/LL	281/340	121/340	N/A	N/A	0/20 6/20	(18)
Pitsinis et al, 2015	Cohort	6	PDE	0.39	5	1.95	50	87	18	10	50/50	48/50	87/87	84/87	18/18	18/18	0/10 0/10	(26)
Guo et al, 2014	Cohort	6	PDE	1.25	1	1.25	86	291	N/A	25	80/86	70/86	281/291	255/291	N/A	N/A	3/25 4/25	(28)
Schaafsma <i>et al</i> , 2013	Cohort	3	Mini- FLARE	0.125/0.25	N/A	N/A	32	48	N/A	13	N/A	N/A	48/48	42/48	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	(6)
Liu et al, 2017	Cohort	5	PDE	1	1	1	60	177	N/A	12	60/60	53/60	177/177	106/177	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	(10)
Tong <i>et al</i> , 2014	Cohort	5	PDE	5	2	10	96	N/A	N/A	28	93/96	83/96	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1/29 4/29	(16)
Ji et al, 2017	RCT	7	PDE	0.39	1	0.39	65	243	31	20	N/A	N/A	232/243	198/243	29/31	26/31	N/A N/A	(14)
Hutteman et al, 2011	RCT	$\mathfrak{S}$	Mini- FLARE	0.39	1.6	0.62	10	14	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14/14	10/14	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	(23)
Verbeek et al, 2014	Cohort	3	Mini- FLARE	0.39	1.6	0.62	27	40	2	$\mathfrak{c}$	N/A	N/A	40/40	31/40	5/5	3/5	0/5 2/5	(24)
B, ICG vs. RI																		
		No. 0	), f	Concentration,	Volume,	Dose,		H	I ositive	ositive SLN	IR of pa	atients	IR of (	SLNs	IR posit SLJ	of ive Ns	FNR	

297/301 287/301 583/589 452/589 70/70 55/70 0/46 6/46 (12)

46

N/A 70

246 589

134 301

0.39

---

0.39 5

PDE PDE

2 2

Ballardini *et al*, 2013 Cohort Samorani *et al*, 2015 Cohort

0.4-1.2 2.0-6.0

N/A 134/134 133/134 245/246 231/246 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A

ICG BD (Refs.)

BD

ICG

BD

ICG

BD

mg Procedures SLNs SLNs patients ICG

m

mg/ml

Type tracers Device

Author, year

(25)

nued.	
able I. Conti	

RI
s.
>
G
Ũ
Τ,
$\sim$

	Refs.)	(17)	(20)	(27)	(21)	(22)	(11)	(6)		(29)	(13)	(15)	(23)	(24)			Refs.)
R	BD (	0/18	N/A	0/3	N/A	N/A	180	N/A		3/13	0/24	N/A	N/A	N/A		R	BD (
F	ICG	0/18	N/A	0/3	N/A	N/A	12/	N/A		1/13	0/24	N/A	N/A	N/A		F	ICG
of tive Ns	BD	25/25	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		10/13	27/27	N/A	N/A	20/22		of tive Ns	BD
IR posi SL	ICG	25/25	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		12/13	27/27	N/A	N/A	22/22		IR posi SL	ICG
SLNs	BD	156/201	35/37	58/68	N/A	N/A	N/A	48/48		N/A	141/147	157/162	14/14	155/177		SLNs	BD
IR of 3	ICG	201/201	37/37	68/68	N/A	N/A	N/A	48/48		N/A	147/147	138/162	14/14	177/177		IR of 3	ICG
atients	BD	93/104	23/24	27/28	43/43	27/29	796/821	32/32		17/20	80/80	103/105	10/10	N/A		atients	BD
IR of p	ICG	104/104	23/24	28/28	43/43	29/29	798/821	32/32		20/20	78/80	93/105	10/10	N/A		IR of p	ICG
Positive	SLIN	18	N/A	3	6	N/A	180	13		13	24	27	0	N/A		Positive	patients
	SLNs	25	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	27	N/A	N/A	22			SLNs
	SLNs	201	37	68	N/A	N/A	N/A	48		N/A	147	162	14	177			SLNs
	Procedures	104	24	28	43	29	821	32		20	80	105	10	95			Procedures
	mg ]	0.78	0.62	0.1/10	0.6	N/A	0.39	N/A		N/A	N/A	10	0.62	0.62			mg ]
	volume, ml	5	1.6	1	1	7	1	N/A		1-3	N/A	5	1.6	1.6		Currile V	volume, ml
	_oncentration, mg/ml	0.39	0.39	0.1/10	9.0	N//A	0.39	160/	320uM	5-15	0.5	2	0.39	0.39			concentration, mg/ml
	Device	PDE	Mini- FLARE	PDE	ICG-F	PDE	PDE	Mini-	FLARE	IC-View	CCD	CCD	Mini- FLARE	Mini- FLARE			Device
	NO. OI racers	5	$\mathfrak{S}$	0	3	3	0	$\mathfrak{S}$		0	7	2	3	$\mathfrak{S}$		55 10	racers
	Type t	Cohort	RCT	Cohort	RCT	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort		Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	RCT	Cohort			Type t
	Author, year	Wishart <i>et al</i> , 2012	van der Vorst <i>et al.</i> 2012	Polom <i>et al</i> , 2012	Jung <i>et al</i> , 2014	Hojo <i>et al</i> , 2010	Sugie et al, 2016	Schaafsma et al,	2013	Murawa <i>et al</i> , 2009	Stoffels et al, 2015	Grischke et al, 2015	Hutteman <i>et al</i> , 2011	Verbeek et al, 2014	C, ICG vs. BD and R		Author, year

(17) (20)

25/25 25/25 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A

N/A 19/19

N/A 19/19

12/12

12/12

18 6

25 N/A

201 19

104 12

0.78 0.62

2 1.6

 $0.39 \\ 0.39$ 

PDE Mini-FLARE

 $\omega$   $\omega$ 

Cohort RCT

Wishart et al, 2012

van der Vorst et al, 2012

104/104 102/104

ed.
inu
Cont
I.
ble
Та

C, ICG vs. BD and	RI 																		
															IR.	of			
		No	ب	Concentration	Volume I	eso		1	] Decitive	Positive	IR of p	atients	IR of S	LNs	SLI	Ns	FNR		
Author, year	Type	tracer	rs Device	e mg/ml	ml	mg ]	Procedures S	ILNs	SLNs	patients	ICG	BD	ICG	BD	ICG	BD	ICG E	BD (Re	efs.)
Jung <i>et al</i> , 2014	RCT	3	ICG-F	0.6	1	9.0	43	N/A	N/A	N/A	43/43	43/43	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A N	[/A (2	21)
Hutteman <i>et al</i> , 2011	RCT	Э	Mini- FI ARF	0.39	1.6	0.62	10	14	N/A	N/A	10/10	10/10	14/14	10/14	N/A	N/A	N/A N	I/A (2	23)
				1															
SLNs, sentinel lymph	nodes; IR	, identifi	cation rate	o; FNR, false negati	ve rate; ICC	i, indoc	syanine green;	BD, bl	ue dye; C	ohort, coł	iort study	; PDE, Pho	otoDynam	ic Eye; N/	A, not a	wailabl	e; RCT,	random	nized

*IR of SLNs*. A total of 10 studies with 881 patients investigated the detection rate for SLNs between ICG and RI, and revealed significant differences in the random-effects model (OR=12.05; 95% CI, 1.57-92.74; P=0.02; Fig. 3A). Considering the significant heterogeneity (I<sup>2</sup>=90%; P<0.01), a subgroup analysis was performed according to the dose of ICG, and the results demonstrated that the SLN detection rate of ICG was significantly higher compared with that of the standard dose of RI (OR=21.62; 95% CI, 5.23-89.43; P<0.0001; Fig. 3B) and I<sup>2</sup> dropped from 90 to 0%, which indicated that the heterogeneity comes from the high dose group. Furthermore, a sensitivity and specificity analysis of ICG and RI lymph node detection was performed in the recommended dose group. A total of three studies including 961 lymph nodes reported the accuracy of ICG in lymph node detection was higher compared with RI (Fig. 4).

*IR of positive SLNs*. A total of four studies consisting of 744 patients reported the detection rate of positive SLNs between ICG and RI, which revealed significant differences in the fixed-effects model (OR=21.32; 95% CI, 2.84-160.14; P=0.003; Fig. 5A), indicating that ICG had an improved identification rate of positive SLNs compared with RI.

*FNR*. A total of five studies with 1,326 patients reported the FNR between ICG and RI, which revealed significant differences in the fixed-effects model (OR=0.46; 95% CI 0.23-0.91; P=0.03; Fig. 5B).

# ICG vs. BD

clinical trial; ICG-F, ICG-fluorescence; RI, radioisotope; CCD, charge-coupled camera; FLARE, fluorescence-assisted resection and exploration.

*IR of patients*. A total of 10 studies that included 771 patients reported the detection rate of patients using ICG and BD. The results demonstrated a significant difference in the fixed-effects model (OR=7.17; 95% CI, 3.98-12.94; P<0.00001; Fig. 6A), indicating that the detection rate of ICG was higher compared with BD. There was no heterogeneity ( $I^2=0\%$ . P=0.68; Fig. 6A).

*IR of SLNs*. A total of 10 studies involving 449 patients reported the detection rate for SLNs between ICG and BD. The results identified 1,460 SLNs and the mean number of SLNs (the number of lymph nodes detected/total number of patients) retrieved using ICG was 3.07, which was higher compared with the number of SLNs retrieved using BD (2.35). The fixed-effects model (OR=8.84; 95% CI, 6.71-11.66; P<0.00001; Fig. 6B) was used and significant differences between ICG and BD were observed, demonstrating that ICG had a statistically higher detection rate of SLNs. The heterogeneity was low with  $I^2$ =37% and P=0.11 (Fig. 6B).

*IR of positive SLNs.* A total of four studies involving 246 patients reported the detection rate for positive SLNs

Table II. The quality of the included studies as assessed by the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Sca	e II. The quality of the included studies as assessed by the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality A	Assessment Scale
--	---	------------------

Author year		Sele	ction		Cor rab	npa- ility		Outcom	<b>a</b>	Score	(Refs)
		bele	ettoli		140	inty		Outcom	<i>c</i>	Score	
Hirano et al, 2012		\$	5	\$	☆	\$				9	(19)
Wishart et al, 2012		\$	\$	$\overset{\wedge}{\backsim}$	☆	\$				7	(17)
van der Vorst et al, 2012	$\overset{\wedge}{\sim}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\searrow}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\sim}$	$\overrightarrow{\Sigma}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$			7	(20)
Jung et al, 2014	$\overset{\wedge}{\sim}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\searrow}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\sim}$	$\overrightarrow{\Sigma}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	${\backsim}$		8	(21)
Hojo et al, 2010	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\searrow}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\backsim}$	$\overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$			7	(22)
Sugie et al, 2013	$\overset{\wedge}{\sim}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\searrow}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\sim}$	$\overrightarrow{\Sigma}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	${\backsim}$		8	(18)
Pitsinis et al, 2015	$\overset{\wedge}{\sim}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\searrow}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\sim}$	$\overrightarrow{\Sigma}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	${\backsim}$		8	(26)
Guo et al, 2014	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\backsim}$	$\overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$			7	(28)
Schaafsma et al, 2013	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	2			7	(9)
Liu et al, 2017	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\backsim}$	$\overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	${\swarrow}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	9	(10)
Tong et al, 2014	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	2			7	(16)
Ji et al, 2017	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	2	$\overset{\wedge}{\searrow}$		8	(14)
Hutteman et al, 2011	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	2			7	(23)
Verbeek et al, 2014	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	2			7	(24)
Ballardini et al, 2013	$\overset{\wedge}{\sim}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\Delta$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$			7	(25)
Samorani et al, 2015	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\searrow}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$			7	(12)
Polom et al, 2012	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\searrow}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$			7	(27)
Sugie et al, 2016	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\searrow}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$			7	(11)
Murawa et al, 2009	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\searrow}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$			7	(29)
Grischke et al, 2015	$\overrightarrow{x}$	\$	\$	\$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$		$\overrightarrow{\mathbf{x}}$			6	(15)
Stoffels et al, 2015	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\swarrow}$	\$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	$\overset{\wedge}{\searrow}$	\$	$\overrightarrow{\mathbf{x}}$			7	(13)



Figure 1. Flow diagram for the selection of the including studies. RCT, randomized clinical trial.

	Pool	ed estimates	Heter	rogeneity
Variable	OR	95% CI	$\overline{\mathrm{I}^2,\%}$	P-value
IR of patients				
ICG vs. BD	7.17	3.98-12.94	0	0.68
ICG vs. RI	1.63	0.65-4.10	55	0.02
Standard dose of reference	1.77	1.09-2.85	47	0.11
More than standard dose	0.86	0.41-1.83	71	0.02
Less than standard dose	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ICG vs. BD and RI				
IR of SLNs				
ICG vs. BD	8.84	6.71-11.66	37	0.11
ICG vs. RI	12.05	1.57-92.74	90	< 0.05
Standard dose of reference	21.62	5.23-89.43	0	0.53
More than standard dose	2.50	1.56-3.99	95	< 0.05
Less than standard dose	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
IR of positive SLNs				
ICG vs. BD	3.54	0.78-16.06	0	0.59
ICG vs. RI	21.32	2.85-160.14	0	0.34
ICG vs. BD and RI	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
FNR				
ICG vs. BD	0.20	0.08-0.48	0	0.59
ICG vs. RI	0.46	0.23-0.91	23	0.27
ICG vs. BD and RI	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

# Table III. Results of the meta-analysis.

OR, odds ratio; IR, identification rate; ICG, indocyanine green; BD, blue dye; RI, radioisotope; N/A, not available; SLNs, sentinel lymph nodes; FNR, false negative rate.

between ICG and BD. The results revealed no differences in the fixed-effects model (OR=3.54; 95% CI, 0.78-16.06; P=0.10; Fig. 6C). However, the overall detection rate of positive SLNs (the number of positive lymph nodes detected/total positive lymph nodes) using ICG was 97.5% and the detection rate of using BD was 91.1%. No heterogeneity was observed at I<sup>2</sup>=0% and P=0.59.

*FNR*. A total of eight studies including 683 patients reported the FNR between ICG and BD, a total of 154 positive SLNs were identified and the overall FNR (the number of positive lymph nodes not detected/total positive lymph nodes) using ICG was 3.25%. This was lower than the FNR of using BD, which was 16.88%. Using the fixed-effects model, the results revealed significant differences (OR=0.20; 95% CI, 0.08-0.48; P=0.0004; Fig. 6D), which demonstrated that ICG had a lower FNR compared with BD. There was no heterogeneity at I<sup>2</sup>=0% and P=0.59. For further analysis, sensitivity and specificity analyses on this group of studies were performed and the results demonstrated that the accuracy of ICG was higher compared with that of BD in lymph node detection (Fig. 7).

*ICG vs BD and RI*. A total of four studies including 169 patients reported the detection rate of patients with ICG

and BD combined with RI. The identification rate using the ICG method was 100%, while the identification rate of patients using the BD combined with the RI method ranged from 98-100%. No difference was reported in the fixed-effects model (OR=5.10; 95% CI, 0.24-107.48; Fig. 8A). Therefore, heterogeneity was not applicable.

Only two studies with 22 patients provided data on the detection rate of SLNs with ICG and BD combined with RI. The mean number of SLNs (the number of lymph nodes detected/total number of patients) retrieved using ICG was 1.50, which was more compared with the number detected using BD combined with RI at 1.32. No difference was revealed in the fixed-effects model (OR=12.43; 95% CI, 0.60-256.66; Fig. 8B), with heterogeneity not being applicable.

For groups with <10 studies, the publication bias was not assessed. The Egger's test was performed using the software Stata. No obvious publication bias was found since P=0.700 (Fig. 9A) and 0.259 (Fig. 9B) for IR of patients and IR of SLNs, respectively.

## Discussion

The number of lymph nodes obtained from SLNB is used as a guide to decide whether or not to continue subsequent



	ICG	i	RI			Odds Ratio			Odds Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C		M-H	I, Random, 9	5% CI	
Ballardini, 2013 (25)	134	134	133	134	6.1%	3.02 [0.12, 74.86]					
Grischke, 2015 (15)	93	105	103	105	14.4%	0.15 [0.03, 0.69]	-	•			
Hojo, 2010 (22)	29	29	27	29	6.5%	5.36 [0.25, 116.76]		-		•	
Hutteman, 2011 (23)	10	10	10	10		Not estimable					
Jung, 2014 (21)	43	43	43	43		Not estimable					
Murawa, 2009 (29)	20	20	17	20	6.7%	8.20 [0.40, 169.90]					
Polom, 2012 (27)	28	28	27	28	6.0%	3.11 [0.12, 79.64]					
Samorani, 2015 (12)	297	301	287	301	17.5%	3.62 [1.18, 11.13]					
Schaafsma, 2013 (30)	32	32	32	32		Not estimable					
Stoffels, 2015 (13)	78	80	80	80	6.6%	0.20 [0.01, 4.13]	←			_	
Sugie, 2016 (11)	798	821	796	821	21.6%	1.09 [0.61, 1.94]			-		
van der Vorst, 2012 (20)	23	24	23	24	7.3%	1.00 [0.06, 16.97]					
Wishart, 2012 (17)	104	104	93	104	7.3%	25.71 [1.49, 442.24]					
Total (95% CI)		1731		1731	100.0%	1.63 [0.65, 4.10]				•	
Total events	1689		1671								
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.95	; Chi² = 1	9.91, df	= 9 (P =	0.02); I	² = 55%						
Test for overall effect: Z =	1.03 (P = 0	0.30)	,	,.			0.01	0.1	1 ICG RI	10	100

В		ICG		RI			Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
_	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
	6.2.1 Recommended dos	e of ICG						
	Ballardini, 2013 (25)	134	134	133	134	1.2%	3.02 [0.12, 74.86]	
	Hutteman, 2011 (23)	10	10	10	10		Not estimable	
	Jung, 2014 (21)	43	43	43	43		Not estimable	
	Samorani, 2015 (12)	190	192	184	192	4.7%	4.13 [0.87, 19.71]	<u> </u>
	Sugie, 2016 (11)	798	821	796	821	54.8%	1.09 [0.61, 1.94]	
	van der Vorst, 2012 (20)	23	24	23	24	2.4%	1.00 [0.06, 16.97]	
	Wishart, 2012 (17)	104	104	93	104	1.1%	25.71 [1.49, 442.24]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)		1328		1328	64.2%	1.77 [1.09, 2.85]	-
	Total events	1302		1282				
	Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 7.51	, df = 4 (P	= 0.11	); l² = 479	Ж			
	Test for overall effect: Z = 3	2.33 (P = 0	).02)					
	6.2.2 More than recomm	ended dos	se of IC	G				
	Grischke, 2015 (15)	93	105	103	105	28.9%	0.15 (0.03, 0.69)	<b>_</b>
	Murawa, 2009 (29)	20	20	17	20	1.0%	8.20 [0.40, 169.90]	
	Polom. 2012 (27)	28	28	27	28	1.2%	3.11 [0.12, 79.64]	
	Samorani, 2015 (12)	107	109	103	109	4.6%	3.12 [0.61, 15.80]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)		262		262	35.8%	0.86 [0.41, 1.83]	
	Total events	248		250				
	Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 10.1	8, df = 3 (	P = 0.0	l2); l² = 71	%			
	Test for overall effect: Z = I	0.38 (P = (	).70)					
	623 Less than recomme	on hohne	e of IC	G				
	Schoofema 2013 (30)	37	22	22	32		Not estimable	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	52	32	52	32		Not estimable	
	Total events	32		32				
	Heterogeneity: Not applica	able						
	Test for overall effect: Not	applicable	9					
	Total (05% CI)		1622		1622	100.0%	1 44 [0 07 2 15]	•
	Total avante	1692	1022	1564	1022	100.070	1.44 [0.51, 2.15]	•
	Hotorogonoity: Chiž – 17 6	1002 7 df= 07	0-00	1004 12\-12 - 54	:06			
	Tect for overall effect: 7 - :	77, UI – O ( 1 O / D – 7	ר – 0.0 1071 ו	(2), (14 00	070			0.01 0.1 i 10 100 <sup>°</sup>
	Test for subgroup differen	noo (F − t inas: Chi≇i	- 2 4 7	df = 1 /P	= 0.12	) IZ= 50 A	596	ICG RI

Figure 2. Comparison of ICG and RI in the IR of patients. (A) Results prior to grouping ICG doses. (B) Results following grouping of ICG doses. ICG, indocyanine green; RI, radioisotope; IR, identification rate; M-H, Mantel-Haensze.

axillary lymph node dissection according to the latest National Comprehensive Cancer Network guidelines (10). Although the range of the armpit area subjected to surgery has been a decreasing, the accuracy of lymph node biopsies is becoming increasingly important and obtaining effective and convenient tracers are particularly important for surgeons (11).



Figure 3. Comparison of ICG and RI in the IR of sentinel lymph nodes. (A) Results prior to grouping ICG doses. (B) Results following grouping of ICG doses. ICG, indocyanine green; RI, radioisotope; IR, identification rate; M-H, Mantel-Haensze.

The near-infrared fluorescence released by the ICG after being excited by infrared light can be imaged using an *in vitro* device, revealing the shape of the lymphatic vessel and positioning the breast SLN (6). It is a sufficient *in vivo* imaging tool due to its soft tissue penetration and is less disturbed by natural light (10).

The use of BD has the advantages of being inexpensive and easy to prepare intraoperatively (12); however, the surgeon needs to rely on vision to locate lymph nodes during tracing. Therefore, the detection rate is more dependent on the surgeon's experience and requires a longer learning curve. Additionally, the low detection rate of SLNs and high FNR render it an unsuitable tracer agent (10). RI can aid in positioning SLNs by detecting  $\gamma$  rays from lymph nodes on the body surface (13). It is superior to BD in detection rate; however, it has an increased surgery cost and complex operation as radioactive tracers need to be injected into the patient the day prior to surgery (10). Furthermore, the subsequent processing of radionuclides limits their use in high-volume centers (6,12).

Although the combined use of BD and RI increases the detection rate of SLNs, the advantages of an inexpensive procedure and rapid localization of lymph nodes do not apply. ICG has the clinical advantages of both BD and



Figure 4. Comparison of the sensitivity and specificity between ICG and RI subgroups. (A) Forest plot of tests and (B) the summary of receiver operating characteristic plot of tests for the two study groups, indicating the accuracy of ICG in lymph node detection was higher compared with that of RI. ICG, indocyanine green; RI, radioisotope; TP, true positive; FP, false positive; FN, false negative; TN, true negative.

0.5

Specificity

0.4

0.3

RI (14). ICG is a real-time navigation system that can guide the surgical procedure with visible lymphatic drainage using near-infrared fluorescence devices (12). Furthermore, ICG has the advantages of low cost and convenient preparation prior to surgery compared with BD (15). Additionally, ICG

♦ RI test

has the potential to improve operating room efficiency considering that patients are not required to visit the nuclear medicine department prior to surgery, which may contribute to improved patients experience (12). Although the required dose of RI carries safety concerns for healthcare

0.2

0.1

Ó

10

Sensitivity

0.5

0.4

0.3

0.2

0.1

0

O ICG test

0.9

0.8

0.7

0.6



Figure 5. Comparison of ICG and RI in the other outcomes. (A) Comparison of ICG and RI in the identification rate of positive sentinel lymph nodes. (B) Comparison of the false negative rate of ICG and RI. ICG, indocyanine green; RI, radioisotope; M-H, Mantel-Haensze.

professionals, using a non-radiative substance can certainly be an advantage (12).

A meta-analysis by Ahmed *et al* (5) demonstrated that ICG was superior to BD in with regard to the IR of SLNs. Furthermore, Sugie *et al* (6) reported that the ICG fluorescence method was better at determining axillary staging compared with the RI method. However, this previous meta-analysis (5) did not agree with the results of the present study, which indicated that ICG was superior to RI in the detection rate of SLNs and the positive SLN detection rate. Additionally, the current meta-analysis indicated that when the dose was limited to the standard dose, there was still a significant difference in the combined OR.

The effect of the ICG dose on the tracer effect has been controversial. Mitsuo et al (31) hypothesized that the concentration and total dose of ICG injection varies depending on the application. For instance, 2.5 mg/ml concentration and 0.5-1.0 ml ICG are generally used for breast cancer SLN navigation surgery. However, there is certain evidence of improved SLN detection rate at a concentration of 0.5 mg/ml compared with 2.5 mg/ml concentration. The present study analyzed the traceability of ICG by dose. The grouping of ICG doses was based on a study by Mieog et al (30), which concluded that the optimal dose of ICG was between 400 and 800  $\mu$ M by assigning patients to different ICG concentration groups of 50-1,000  $\mu$ M. As per the study by Mieog et al (30), the grouping of ICG doses is reasonable. The results of the current study demonstrated that using the recommended dose of ICG obtained an improved detection result and the use of a higher dose may cause difficulties in detection due to leakage of fluorescent tracer in lymphatic vessels (14).

The present study has the following differences compared with previous studies. Firstly, the condition of patients being their own controls was incorporated into the inclusion criteria, which avoids bias due to population differences. Secondly, the patient detection rate was differentiated from the SLN detection rate, making the definition 'sentinel lymph node detection rate' more objective. Lastly, different doses of ICG ultimately have different effects on lymph node detection, which provided guidance for the future use of ICG doses.

The present meta-analysis compared ICG with BD combined with RI in breast cancer. The results demonstrated that ICG alone is not significantly different to BD combined with RI in terms of the detection rate of patients and the detection rate of SLNs, indicating that ICG alone is not worse compared with BD combined with RI. Although there was no statistical difference observed in the overall lymph node detection rate using ICG at 100%, this was higher than the 87.88% of BD combined with RI.

Several limitations in the current meta-analysis should be noted. Firstly, the ICG fluorescence imaging equipment used by the previous studies was not uniform; therefore, data was extracted from studies that used different equipment, including PDE, Mini-FLARE and CCD. Among these, PDE was the most commonly used. However, other equipment have also been used clinically and were able to achieve a high detection rate of SLNs. Secondly, the definition of SLNs varies in different trials. Wishart *et al* (17) demonstrated that all tracers (including ICG, BD and RI) detected lymph nodes as SLNs, while Sugie *et al* (18) concluded that intraoperatively palpable lymph nodes, termed para-SLN, should also be classified as SLNs. Other studies (19-21) did not reach the



 Heterogeneity:  $Chi^2 = 3.74$ , df = 5 (P = 0.59);  $l^2 = 0\%$  0.01
 0.1
 1
 10
 100

 Test for overall effect: Z = 3.57 (P = 0.0004)
 ICG BD
 ICG BD
 ICG BD
 ICG BD

Figure 6. Comparison of ICG and BD in different outcomes. (A) IR of patients. (B) IR of SLNs. (C) Result of IR of positive SLNs. (D) False negative rate results of ICG and BD. ICG, indocyanine green; BD, blue dye; IR, identification rate; SLNs, sentinel lymph nodes; M-H, Mantel-Haensze.

same conclusion. Therefore, altering the intended definition of SLN may lead to certain differences in the detection rate of SLN. Thirdly, the criteria for enrollment for each trial were different, particularly in regard to previous axillary surgery history. Although all patients were clinically node-negative, there were studies that did not specify the exclusion criteria,



Figure 7. Comparison of sensitivity and specificity between ICG and BD. (A) Forest plot of tests and (B) the summary of receiver operating characteristic plot of tests for the two study groups, indicating the accuracy of ICG in lymph node detection was higher compared with that of BD. ICG, indocyanine green; BD, blue dye; TP, true positive; FP, false positive; FN, false negative; TN, true negative.

0.5

Specificity

0.4

making the patients heterogeneous in the present meta-analysis. Lastly, the authors may have missed certain unpublished investigations, considering studies with positive results are usually more prone to being published.

0.9

0.8

♦ BD test

0.7

0.6

0.1

0

O ICG test

In conclusion, the present comprehensive meta-analysis indicated that using ICG alone is a better tracer agent compared

with using BD or RI alone, and is not worse compared with BD combined with RI. A suitable dose of ICG can increase the detectability and accuracy, and decrease the heterogeneity. Considering the clinical convenience of ICG, it may be used as a suitable alternative to traditional tracers to detect SLNs in patients with breast cancer.

0.2

0.1

0.3





Figure 8. Comparison of ICG and BD combined with RI in different outcomes. (A) IR of patients. (B) IR of sentinel lymph nodes. ICG, indocyanine green; BD, blue dye; RI, radioisotope; IR, identification rate; M-H, Mantel-Haensze.



Figure 9. Funnel plots with Egger's test were used to identify publication bias. (A) Result of publication bias in IR of patients and (B) results of IR of SLNs for the two study groups. No obvious publication bias was observed. IR, identification rate.

# Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

### Funding

No funding was received.

# Availability of data and materials

The datasets generated and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

# Authors' contributions

RY conceived the current study and collected data. XZ put forward the concept of ICG as a new tracer superior to traditional tracers and helped design the article and gave final approval of the version to be published, participated in the revision of the article, checked the data, provided the final conclusion for the version to be published, provided support for obtaining some documents in the article, provided administrative support and gave final approval of the version to be published. LD, QW, YZ and GT collected, analyzed and interpreted the data. RY drafted and revised the manuscript.

#### Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

#### Patient consent for publication

Not applicable.

#### **Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

#### References

- Mansel RE, Fallowfield L, Kissin M, Goyal A, Newcombe RG, Dixon JM, Yiangou C, Horgan K, Bundred N, Monypenny I, *et al*: Randomized multicenter trial of sentinel node biopsy versus standard axillary treatment in operable breast cancer: The ALMANAC trial. J Natl Cancer Inst 98: 599-609, 2006.
- Krag DN, Weaver DL, Alex JC and Fairbank JT: Surgical resection and radiolocalization of the sentinel lymph node in breast cancer using a gamma probe. Surg Oncol 2: 335-340, 1993.
- 3. Giuliano AE, Kirgan DM, Guenther JM and Morton DL: Lymphatic mapping and sentinel lymphadenectomy for breast cancer. Ann Surg 220: 391-401, 1994.
- 4. Kitai T, Inomoto T, Miwa M and Shikayama T: Fluorescence navigation with indocyanine green for detecting sentinel lymph nodes in breast cancer. Breast Cancer 12: 211-215, 2005.
- 5. Ahmed M, Purushotham AD and Douek M: Novel techniques for sentinel lymph node biopsy in breast cancer: A systematic review. Lancet Oncol 15: e351-e362, 2014.
- Sugie T, Ikeda T, Kawaguchi A, Shimizu A and Toi M: Sentinel lymph node biopsy using indocyanine green fluorescence in early-stage breast cancer: A meta-analysis. Int J Clin Oncol 22: 11-17, 2017.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J and Altman DG; PRISMA Group: Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. Ann Intern Med 151: 264-269, W64, 2009.

- 8. Stang A: Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. Eur J Epidemiol 25: 603-605, 2010.
- 9. Schaafsma BE, Verbeek FP, Rietbergen DD, van der Hiel B, van der Vorst JR, Liefers GJ, Frangioni JV, van de Velde CJ, van Leeuwen FW and Vahrmeijer AL: Clinical trial of combined radio and fluorescence guided sentinel lymph node biopsy in breast cancer. Br J Surg 100: 1037-1044, 2013.
- Liu J, Huang L, Wang N and Chen P: Indocyanine green detects sentinel lymph nodes in early breast cancer. J Int Med Res 45: 514-524, 2017.
- Sugie T, Kinoshita T, Masuda N, Sawada T, Yamauchi A, Kuroi K, Taguchi T, Bando H, Yamashiro H, Lee T, *et al*: Evaluation of the clinical utility of the ICG fluorescence method compared with the radioisotope method for sentinel lymph node biopsy in breast cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 23: 44-50, 2016.
   Samorani D, Fogacci T, Panzini I, Frisoni G, Accardi FG,
- 12. Samorani D, Fogacci T, Panzini I, Frisoni G, Accardi FG, Ricci M, Fabbri E, Nicoletti S, Flenghi L, Tamburini E, *et al*: The use of indocyanine green to detect sentinel nodes in breast cancer: A prospective study. Eur J Surg Oncol 41: 64-70, 2015.
- 13. Stoffels I, Dissemond J, Pöppel T, Schadendorf D and Klode J: Intraoperative fluorescence imaging for sentinel lymph node detection: Prospective clinical trial to compare the usefulness of indocyanine green vs technetium Tc 99m for identification of sentinel lymph nodes. JAMA Surg 150: 617-623, 2015.
- sentinel lymph nodes. JAMA Surg 150: 617-623, 2015.
  14. Ji Y, Luo N, Jiang Y, Li Q, Wei W, Yang H and Liu J: Clinical utility of the additional use of blue dye for indocyanine green for sentinel node biopsy in breast cancer. J Surg Res 215: 88-92, 2017.
- Grischke EM, Röhm C, Hahn M, Helms G, Brucker S and Wallwiener D: ICG fluorescence technique for the detection of sentinel lymph nodes in breast cancer: Results of a prospective open-label clinical trial. Geburtshilfe Frauenheilk 75: 935-940, 2015.
- 16. Tong M, Guo W and Gao W: Use of fluorescence imaging in combination with patent blue dye versus patent blue dye alone in sentinel lymph node biopsy in breast cancer. J Breast Cancer 17: 250-255, 2014.
- Wishart GC, Loh SW, Jones L and Benson JR: A feasibility study (ICG-10) of indocyanine green (ICG) fluorescence mapping for sentinel lymph node detection in early breast cancer. Eur J Surg Oncol 38: 651-656, 2012.
- 18. Sugie T, Sawada T, Tagaya N, Kinoshita T, Yamagami K, Suwa H, Ikeda T, Yoshimura K, Niimi M, Shimizu A and Toi M: Comparison of the indocyanine green fluorescence and blue dye methods in detection of sentinel lymph nodes in early-stage breast cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 20: 2213-2218, 2013.
- 19. Hirano A, Kamimura M, Ogura K, Kim N, Hattori A, Setoguchi Y, Okubo F, Inoue H, Miyamoto R, Kinoshita J, et al: A comparison of indocyanine green fluorescence imaging plus blue dye and blue dye alone for sentinel node navigation surgery in breast cancer patients. Ann Surg Oncol 19: 4112-4116, 2012.
- 20. van der Vorst JR, Schaafsma BE, Verbeek FP, Hutteman M, Mieog JS, Lowik CW, Liefers GJ, Frangioni JV, van de Velde CJ and Vahrmeijer AL: Randomized comparison of near-infrared fluorescence imaging using indocyanine green and 99(m) technetium with or without patent blue for the sentinel lymph node procedure in breast cancer patients. Ann Surg Oncol 19: 4104-4111, 2012.
- Jung SY, Kim SK, Kim SW, Kwon Y, Lee ES, Kang HS, Ko KL, Shin KH, Lee KS, Park IH, *et al*: Comparison of sentinel lymph node biopsy guided by the multimodal method of indocyanine green fluorescence, radioisotope, and blue dye versus the radioisotope method in breast cancer: A randomized controlled trial. Ann Surg Oncol 21: 1254-1259, 2014.
   Hojo T, Nagao T, Kikuyama M, Akashi S and Kinoshita T:
- 22. Hojo T, Nagao T, Kikuyama M, Akashi S and Kinoshita T: Evaluation of sentinel node biopsy by combined fluorescent and dye method and lymph flow for breast cancer. Breast 19: 210-213, 2010.
- 23. Hutteman M, Mieog JS, van der Vorst JR, Liefers GJ, Putter H, Löwik CW, Frangioni JV, van de Velde CJ and Vahrmeijer AL: Randomized, double-blind comparison of indocyanine green with or without albumin premixing for near-infrared fluorescence imaging of sentinel lymph nodes in breast cancer patients. Breast Cancer Res Treat 127: 163-170, 2011.
- Breast Cancer Res Treat 127: 163-170, 2011.
  24. Verbeek FP, Troyan SL, Mieog JS, Liefers GJ, Moffitt LA, Rosenberg M, Hirshfield-Bartek J, Gioux S, van de Velde CJ, Vahrmeijer AL and Frangioni JV: Near-infrared fluorescence sentinel lymph node mapping in breast cancer: A multicenter experience. Breast Cancer Res Treat 143: 333-342, 2014.

- 25. Ballardini B, Santoro L, Sangalli C, Gentilini O, Renne G, Lissidini G, Pagani GM, Toesca A, Blundo C, del Castillo A, et al: The indocyanine green method is equivalent to the 99mTc-labeled radiotracer method for identifying the sentinel node in breast cancer: A concordance and validation study. Eur J Surg Oncol 39: 1332-1336, 2013.
- 26. Pitsinis V, Provenzano E, Kaklamanis L, Wishart GC and Benson JR: Indocyanine green fluorescence mapping for sentinel lymph node biopsy in early breast cancer. Surg Oncol 24: 375-379, 2015.
- 27. Polom K, Murawa D, Nowaczyk P, Rho YS and Murawa P: Breast cancer sentinel lymph node mapping using near infrared guided indocyanine green and indocyanine green-human serum albumin in comparison with gamma emitting radioactive colloid tracer. Eur J Surg Oncol 38: 137-142, 2012. 28. Guo W, Zhang L, Ji J, Gao W, Liu J and Tong M: Evaluation of
- the benefit of using blue dye in addition to indocyanine green fluorescence for sentinel lymph node biopsy in patients with breast cancer. World J Surg Oncol 12: 290, 2014.

- 29. Murawa D, Hirche C, Dresel S and Hünerbein M: Sentinel lymph node biopsy in breast cancer guided by indocyanine green fluorescence. Br J Surg 96: 1289-1294, 2009.
- 30. Mieog JS, Troyan SL, Hutteman M, Donohoe KJ, Van Der Vorst JR, Stockdale A, Liefers GJ, Choi HS, Gibbs-Strauss SL, Putter H, et al: Toward optimization of imaging system and lymphatic tracer for near-infrared fluorescent sentinel lymph node mapping in breast cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 18: 2483-2491, 2011.
- 31. Kusano M, Kokudo N, Toi M and Kaibori M (eds): ICG fluorescence imaging and navigation surgery. Springer, Japan, 2016.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) License.